



**PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR NY 10510**

COPY MAILED

MAR 20 2009

In re Application of
Ming-Hung LIN
Application No. 09/989,255
Filed: November 20, 2001
Attorney Docket No. TW 000008

OFFICE OF PETITIONS
DECISION ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed February 06, 2009, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

The application became abandoned for failure to reply in a timely manner to the non-final Office action mailed May 14, 2008, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three (3) months. No extensions of time under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a) were obtained. Accordingly, the application became abandoned on August 15, 2008.

The petition satisfies the conditions for revival pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) in that (1) the reply in the form of an amendment; (2) the petition fee of \$1620.00; and (3) the required statement of unintentional delay have been received. Accordingly, the reply to the non-final Office action of May 14, 2008, is accepted as having been unintentionally delayed.

It is not apparent whether the person signing the statement of unintentional delay was in a position to have firsthand or direct knowledge of the facts and circumstances of the delay at issue. Nevertheless, such statement is being treated as having been made as the result of a reasonable inquiry into the facts and circumstances of such delay. See 37 CFR 10.18(b) and Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53178 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 103 (October 21, 1997). In the event that such an inquiry has not been made, petitioner must make such an inquiry. If such inquiry results in the discovery that it is not correct that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional, petitioner must notify the Office.

There is no indication that the person signing the petition was ever given a power of attorney to prosecute the application. If the person signing the petition desires to receive future correspondence regarding this application, the appropriate power of attorney document must be submitted. While a courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the person signing the petition, all future correspondence will be directed to the address currently of record until appropriate instructions are received.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-4231.

The application file is being referred to Technology Center AU 2617 for appropriate action on the concurrently filed amendment.



Michelle R. Eason
Paralegal Specialist
Office of Petitions

Cc: **MATTHEW I. COHEN**
VOLPE AND KOEING, P.C.
UNITED PLAZA, SUITE 1600
30 SOUTH 17TH STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103